



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

any written works on the subject. In some future number of this work the attempt may be made to concentrate and combine the important points deduced from the experience of our hospitals, in an article on the Construction and Management of Institutions for the Insane.

8. — *A Discourse on the Life and Character of the Hon. George Mathews, late Presiding Judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana.* By the Hon. CHARLES WATTS, at the Request of the Members of the Bar of New Orleans. New Orleans. Benjamin Levy. 1837. 12mo. pp. 15.

THIS is a plain biographical sketch, very little in the style of panegyric. The facts of a life, not eventful, are detailed with modesty and distinctness, if not in a way calculated to produce a strong impression. The subject of the Discourse was a highly respectable judge of Louisiana, who died November 10th, 1836, in the sixty-third year of his age. In 1805, without any solicitation on his part, he was appointed by President Jefferson, judge of the territory of Mississippi, whence he was transferred to the territory of Orleans, in 1806. On the erection of Louisiana into a State, in 1812, he was appointed by Governor Clairborne judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana, and shortly afterwards, by the resignation of an associate on the bench, took the place of presiding judge. This honorable station he occupied till his death.

9. — *The Œdipus Tyrannus of Sophocles, with Notes and a Critique on the Subject of the Play.* By J. W. STUART, Professor of Greek and Roman Literature in the College of South Carolina. New York; Gould & Newman. 1837. 12mo. pp. 222.

THE Œdipus Tyrannus is universally acknowledged to be one of the greatest masterpieces of the Athenian stage. In the regularity and perfectness of its plot, the polish of its style, and the appalling developement of its catastrophe, it is eminently calculated to excite the most lively interest of the scholar and the man of taste. It has scenes of passion which Shakspeare has hardly surpassed; touches of pathos and tenderness, in which the deepest feelings of the human heart are most beautifully expressed;

and over all, the cloud of inexorable destiny is gathering, from the very beginning, darker and thicker, until it bursts and pours its desolating storm upon the devoted heads of the royal house. With such claims upon the mind and heart, it is not surprising that this tragedy has been selected as a text-book, wherever Greek literature is taught, both in Europe and America; and Mr. Stuart has rendered a valuable service to scholars and teachers, by publishing the excellent edition, whose title we have copied above. The text is accurately, and even beautifully printed. This is followed by a copious English commentary, explaining difficult constructions and grammatical peculiarities, and pointing out the structure of the plot. Allusions to customs and manners are illustrated at considerable length; and numerous references to parallel passages in other tragedies are given. The essay at the end of the volume contains a critique on the subject of *Œdipus*, as treated by other authors, particularly by Seneca, Corneille, and Voltaire. This Critique shows a just taste, and a wide range of reading in general literature. We believe the volume, on the whole, will be considered as indicating very fair scholarship, great industry, and highly respectable talents.

There are, however, a few points, which we shall not hesitate to censure. It seems to us, that the notes abound too much in learned technicals, for common use. These "lang-nebbed" polysyllables have an imposing air, and pass with many for profound learning. But the fashion is gone by, with powdered wigs and hooped petticoats; and the cumbrous array of scholastic lore, once so common, has justly fallen into general disrespect. In the next place, Mr. Stuart has adopted an unusual mode of spelling certain classical names, which looks affected. We hardly recognise our old friends, *Œdipus*, *Æschylus*, &c., in the disguise of *Edipus*, *Eschylus*; and no consistency is preserved, for *Ælian* is written as it should be, and *Œdipus* is himself again, at the head of the critical essay. To adopt such whimsical peculiarities, contrary to the general usage of our language, and unaccompanied by the slightest advantage, is, we must needs say it, literary foppery.

In reading the notes, a few things occurred to us, which, we think, will deserve Mr. Stuart's attention, in a second edition. The note on *ἐξεστεμμένοι*, line 3, is wrong, as well as the remark upon the dative *κλάδοισιν*. The participle evidently agrees with the pronoun understood, and the dative is constructed with it, *Decked with suppliant boughs*. In the note to line 91, Mr. Stuart says, "Creon is unwilling to explain *πλησιαζόντων*, in the presence of the multitude. He has learned from Apollo, that *Œdipus* himself is the murderer to be punished," &c. This is most clearly a

mistake. Creon has received an oracular response, but it was conveyed in dark and ambiguous terms, and said not a word about Œdipus. It merely intimated, that the crime of murder was upon the land; and the wrath of the Gods would be withdrawn, when that murder was expiated. Of course, had Creon been clearly informed that Œdipus was the murderer, the whole thing would have been settled at the outset. In line 148, the pronoun ὃς is referred, by Mr. Stuart, to Creon. The context shows, that Œdipus is the person intended; and the verb *ἐξαγγέλλεται* may be strictly rendered in the present tense, *For "he promises,"* i. e. Œdipus. The object of the assembly was to entreat the king, whom they regarded as the first of men, to interpose his wisdom for their deliverance. This he had solemnly promised to do; and their object being attained, they withdrew. Line 160, "*γαῖόχορον, encircling this earth,* i. e. the Bœotian territory." The epithet seems to be a general one, and has no reference to any particular territory. In the long note to lines 227-9, an explanation of *ὑπεξελόν* is given, from which we wholly dissent. In connexion with *ἐπικλημα*, it is translated, *taking out an indictment*. It means, evidently, *suppressing an accusation*, or keeping back, or keeping secret, a charge against himself. Line 231, "*ἄλλον, a foreigner.*" It means simply *another*. Œdipus has solemnly adjured the perpetrator to come forward and confess. He next adjures him who knows, *ἄλλον, another* to be the murderer, to inform. Line 263, "*ἐκείνον κράτα,* in reference to *γένος*, i. e. the child of Laius, &c." We think the translation censured by Mr. Stuart, the right one. The pronoun plainly refers to Laius. It is the same pronoun that occurs twice within two lines, where it *must* refer to him; and besides, Œdipus was as yet ignorant of the exposure of the child. The expression about the calamities of the king, in the preceding line, does not refer to a *child*, but to the *race* or *family*, *γένος*, of Laius. "*Ἐνῆλαθ' ἡ τύχη, ill-fortune has been driven in upon him.*" The verb is not from *ἐνελάνω*, as this version seems to imply, but from *ἐνάλλομαι*, *to leap upon*. It is a most animated description of an unexpected or sudden attack of misfortune. Line 270, "*Τινὰ γῆς ἄροτον, any land capable of tillage;*" *ἄροτον* is not an adjective, but a noun meaning *fruit*; *any fruits of the earth*, is the proper translation. Line 306, "*πέμψασιν ἀντέπεμψεν,* a verb with its cognate noun in the accusative." *Πέμψασιν* is not a noun; there is no such noun in the Greek language; but a first aorist participle, in the dative plural, agreeing with *ἡμῖν*. Line 507, "*Ἐπὶ* with the dative, signifying *in the power of.*" It cannot mean that, here. The Sphinx was not in the power of Œdipus. The chorus are speaking of the event

as something that had happened to *Œdipus*, or *in respect to him* with which he had something to do. "*Βασάνω, pledge given.*" It means *test*, or *trial*. Line 525, "*πρὸς τοῦ for τίνος ἐφάνθη*, literally, by whom was it *accused*, which is the sense of *φαίνω*, in Hom. Od. xx. 309." The word has no such meaning, either here, or in the passage cited from Homer. In this line it means simply *appeared*. The line in the *Odyssey* occurs in a speech of Telemachus, after one of the suitors had thrown an ox-hoof at the unknown Ulysses, in which he tells the offender what he would have done to him, had the stranger been hit; therefore, he adds, by way of menace, *μήτις μοι ἀεικέλιος ἐνὶ οἴκῳ φαίνεται*, *let no one show his insolence, or insolent doings, in my house.* *Show* is the proper translation here, and it cannot possibly mean *accuse*. The connexion of the words plainly indicates this, for Telemachus goes on to say, that he is no longer a boy, as he once was, but a man, and they will find it out. Line 624, "*οἷόν ἐστι τὸ φθονεῖν*, *what is your grudge, or the cause of your grudge, against me?*" In this interpretation, Mr. Stuart follows Hermann and others. But in our judgment it is incorrect. Creon knew already the ground of the hatred of *Œdipus*; he was suspected of a conspiracy against him. It would have been idle for Creon then, to insist on the king's showing what was the cause of his grudge; that had already been shown. By translating the words literally, we have a meaning appropriate to the scene, and probable in itself. They may be rendered "*what it is to hate.*" Lines 783-4, "*οἱ δὲ δυσφόρως τοῦννειδος ἤγον*, *they impatiently reproached.*" Here a very common idiom is misunderstood. *Œdipus* had been informing his supposed parents of an insult he had received at a feast. The words cited above describe the manner in which they received the tale, and mean, "*they were indignant or impatient at the reproach,*" and not *they reproached impatiently*. Line 1428, "*ὁμβρός ἱερὸς*, in reference to the sprinkling by lustral water." The meaning is simply, "*sacred shower.*" Creon is describing the horrible pollution of the crimes of *Œdipus*, which neither earth, nor sacred shower (or rain), nor light will admit, and urges the attendants to remove him from sight. The epithet *sacred* is applied by the poets to all the powers and appearances of nature, and to all natural objects, such as *mountains, rivers, lakes, the sea, light, heaven, &c.*

We have selected only a few of the passages which we had marked, in reading, as objectionable. We are aware, that it is easy to find fault with a work of this kind, by seizing upon small inaccuracies, and by representing mere differences of opinion as radical errors. In fact, a formidable list of real mistakes may be

made out by any one, who chooses to look with microscopic eye at any work of philological disquisition ; and yet these mistakes may have a scarcely perceptible effect upon the substantial value of the book. But several of the errors of interpretation that we have pointed out, in the notes upon this tragedy, seem to us of a different description, and to merit consideration ; though we repeat, that on the whole, we regard it as a valuable addition to our means of classical instruction.

10. — *Speech in Behalf of the University of Nashville, delivered on the Day of the Anniversary Commencement, October 4th, 1837.* By PHILIP LINDSLEY.

THIS is one of the most truth-telling and amusing speeches we have ever had from the great West. It is an upright and downright defence of University systems in general, and the Nashville University in particular. Mr. Lindsley talks to the westerners in their own free and bold fashion, and we venture to say they like him all the better for it. He tells them, in a style bordering on conversational plainness, as many truths as they can digest before another commencement, on all the great topics of liberal education ; and scatters, with the breath of a most searching ridicule, the prejudices and absurdities with which, it seems, Nashville, like some other cities, is overflowing, in relation to the University. There are those, we doubt not, who have been shy of the University, ever since the last anniversary. The benefits of scholarship, the advantages held out by Universities, the causes why so many young men fail to make the best use of them, and the remedies which ought to be applied to existing defects, are discussed with thorough knowledge, a fearless spirit, and uncompromising independence.

We notice, in passing, the following remarks. “ Both Harvard and Yale usually employ six or eight tutors, according to the actual number of students, averaging commonly between two and three hundred. These perform all the drudgery of elementary drilling, and attend the daily routine of recitations in the classroom ; *while the professors read lectures, and maintain the dignity of science and of the Senatus Academicus.*” Now the worthy President must have been dreaming of some University in the fabled Atlantis, in the isles of the Blest, or perchance in Nephelococcygia, when he uttered that last sentence. Such a professor would be worth travelling a hundred miles to see. Sure we are, that he cannot be found in New England. Our naturalists have